IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated:- 25.09.2006

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.SATHASIVAM
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.TAMILVANAN

Habeas Corpus Petition No.718 of 2006

Vasanthi ... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State, rep. by Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

2.The District Collector and
District Magistrate,
Thiruvarur District. .. Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the second respondent pertaining to the detention order made in COC No.10 of 2006 dated 20.05.2006 in detaining the petitioner under Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 as a Goonda, quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the detenu viz., Ramaraj @ Sent, S/o Rethina Udyar, who is detained at Central Prison, Trichy before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.O.S.Thilak Pasumbadiyar

For Respondents: Mr.M.Babu Muthu Meeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

WEB COPY

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.SATHASIVAM,J.)

The petitioner, who is the sister of the detenu, by name Ramaraj @ Sent, who is detained as a ''Goonda" as contemplated under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982), by the impugned detention order dated 20.05.2006, challenges the same in this Petition.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

3. At the foremost, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is enormous delay in disposal of the representation of the detenu, which vitiates the ultimate order of detention. With reference to the above claim, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has placed the details, which show that the representation of the detenu was received by the Government on 27.06.2006 and remarks were called for on the same day i.e. on 27.06.2006 and the remarks were received by the Government on 06.07.2006 and the File was submitted on 07.07.2006 and the same was dealt with by the Under Secretary and the Joint Secretary on the same day i.e. on 07.07.2006 and finally, the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed orders on 14.07.2006. The rejection letter was prepared on 18.07.2006 and the same was sent to the detenu on 19.07.2006 and served to him on 21.07.2006. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the Joint Secretary dealt with the file on 07.07.2006, the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed orders only on 14.07.2006 and there is no explanation at all for not passing order till 14.07.2006. In the absence of any explanation by the person concerned even after excluding the intervening holidays, we are of the view that the time taken for passing the order is on the higher side and we hold that the said delay has prejudiced the detenu in disposal of his representation. On this ground, we quash the impugned order of detention.

4. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned order of detention is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith from the custody unless he is required in some other case or cause.

raa

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

To

1. The Secretary to Government, State of Tamil Nadu, Prohibition and Excise Department, Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate, Thiruvarur District.

3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Thiruchirapalli.
(In duplicate for communication to detenu)

4. The Joint Secretary to Government, Public (Law and Order) Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

HCP. No.718 of 2006

BV(CO)
SR/5.10.2006

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/